

**United States District Court**

**EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
LUFKIN DIVISION**

**JOSEPH ANTHONY HANZICH IV**

**V.**

**NACOGDOCHES COUNTY, ET AL.**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 9:23-CV-00087  
JUDGE MICHAEL J. TRUNCALE**

---

**HOTLINE ORDER**

---

This case is assigned to the docket of United States District Judge Michael J. Truncale. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and the Local Rules for the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, this matter came before the undersigned United States Magistrate Judge for determination of a discovery dispute via the “Discovery Hotline” maintained by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas.

On February 6, 2024, counsel for Plaintiff and Defendants contacted this Court two separate times and obtained hotline hearings. During the deposition of Defendant Xander Haynes, Plaintiff’s counsel attempted to ask Mr. Haynes six questions, each of which Defendants’ counsel objected to as outside the scope of qualified immunity. *See* Cause No. 9:23-CV-00087-MJT, Dkt. No. 26 (limiting all discovery to the issue of qualified immunity). Understanding that counsel recorded the hotline hearing on their end (and thus has access to the specific language discussed in relation to each question), the undersigned generally ruled as follows:

Question 1 – objection sustained

Question 2 – objection overruled to the extent Plaintiff’s counsel rephrases the question in line with his representation during the first hotline hearing

Question 3 – objection overruled

Question 4 – objection sustained

Question 5 – Plaintiff’s counsel will rephrase the question in line with the Court’s guidance during the first hotline hearing

Question 6 – Plaintiff’s counsel will rephrase the question in line with the Court’s guidance during the second hotline hearing

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

SIGNED this the 7th day of February, 2024.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
J. Boone Baxter  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE